

## REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed September 13, 2005. Reconsideration of the present case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

### Amendments to Specification

Applicant has amended the Incorporation by Reference section of the specification to indicate that three of the patent applications incorporated by reference at the time the present application was filed have since issued as patents.

### Section 101 Rejections

Claims 54 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims were directed to a memory medium comprising program instructions, without any recitation of computer execution of the program instructions. Applicant has amended these claims to clarify that the memory medium is a computer-readable memory medium.

### Section 112 Rejections

Claims 4-6, 17, 19, 21, 31, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 6, and 21 are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, in light of the claim amendments.

As for claims 4, 17, 19, 31, and 38, these claims were rejected because they recite negative limitations. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Each of these claims introduces a further limitation to the respective claim on which the claim depends. For example, claim 3 recites, “the first application storing information representing the sequence of operations in a data structure.” It will be appreciated by the Examiner that claim 3 places no metes and bounds on the information stored in the data structure. In particular, the information may or may not comprise program code representing the sequence of operations. Claim 4 limits the information by specifying that the information

representing the sequence of operations in the data structure does not comprise program code. Applicant respectfully submits that this is a proper form of claim construction.

### Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kodosky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,438, hereinafter “Kodosky”). Claims 1-58 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Compumotor Motion Builder Start-Up Guide & Tutorial, hereinafter “Compumotor”. Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention and respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A computer-implemented method for invoking a sequence of operations, the method comprising:

a first application displaying a graphical user interface (GUI), wherein the graphical user interface provides GUI access to a set of operations;

the first application creating the sequence, wherein creating the sequence comprises including a plurality of operations in the sequence in response to user input selecting each operation in the plurality of operations from the GUI;

the first application interactively displaying a visual indication of results of performing the sequence while the sequence is being created, wherein the visual indication enables a user to evaluate the results of performing the sequence, wherein interactively displaying the visual indication comprises:

for each operation included in the sequence, updating the displayed visual indication in response to including the operation in the sequence in order to visually indicate a change in the results of performing the sequence, wherein the change is caused by including the operation in the sequence, wherein updating the displayed visual indication provides interactive visual feedback to the user indicating the change caused by including the operation in the sequence;

wherein the method further comprises the first application receiving a request to invoke execution of the sequence from a second program external to the first application; and

the first application executing the sequence in response to the request from the second program, wherein the first application executing the sequence comprises the first application invoking execution of software routines to perform the plurality of operations in the sequence.

In the method recited in claim 1, a visual indication of results of performing the sequence is interactively displayed while the sequence is being created. In response to

including each operation in the sequence, the displayed visual indication is updated to visually indicate a change in the results of performing the sequence, wherein the change is caused by including the operation in the sequence. Interactively updating the displayed visual indication in this manner provides interactive visual feedback to the user indicating the change caused by including the operation in the sequence. Neither of the cited references discloses these features.

Claim 1 also recites, “the first application receiving a request to invoke execution of the sequence from a second program external to the first application” and “the first application executing the sequence in response to the request from the second program”. Thus, the same application that is used to create the sequence, i.e., the first application, receives a request from an external program to invoke execution of the sequence and executes the sequence in response to the request. Neither of the cited references teaches this feature.

Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach the subject matter of claim 1, and thus, claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon are allowable over the cited references. Inasmuch as the other independent claims recite similar limitations as those discussed above with reference to claim 1, Applicant submits that the other independent claims, and the claims respectively dependent thereon, are also allowable over the cited references.

Applicant also submits that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. For example, claim 17 recites the further limitation that, “wherein said first application creating the sequence comprises the first application creating the sequence without receiving user input specifying program code to implement the plurality of operations in the sequence.” Both Kodosky and Compumotor relate to the field of graphical programming, in which a user creates a graphical program by selecting various icons and interconnecting the icons. The icons and the connections between the icons constitute graphical program code that defines the functionality of the graphical program. Neither Kodosky nor Compumotor teaches creating a sequence of operations in response to user input, but without receiving user input specifying program code to implement the operations in the sequence.

Applicant also submits that numerous other dependent claims recite further distinctions over Kodosky and Compumotor. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

## **CONCLUSION**

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-58400/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey C. Hood  
Reg. No. 35,198  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8800  
Date: 12/12/2005 JCH/JLB